

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

NOV 18 1997  
FCC MAIL ROOM



DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-158

1919 Ravens Crest Drive E.  
Plainsboro, N.J.  
08536  
609-716-8915

11/13/97

To whom it may concern;

I'm writing to your office as a direct result of a letter I received today. This letter was extremely alarming to me since it affects my livelihood. Due to the new bill or regulation set forth by your office, I will personally see a dramatic increase in my long distance phone charges. As an employee with a major US airline, my only contact with my family and friends is sometimes on the other end of a pay phone. I have always had an 800 access # for as long as I can remember. This has always made things easier. Now, I am forced to limit my phone calls due to an unbelievable 29 cent surcharge. In my opinion, this is an outrage! On behalf of all the hard working Americans who depend on low costing phone systems, I say, "what about us?" One of many phone services encouraged its customers to contact your office directly. I'm glad I did. If this is all about personal profit, watch how fast myself and the remaining 100,000 airline employees turn their backs on the public phone system.

Very truly yours,

*Debra M. Field*  
*Debra M. Field*

No. of pages received

0

BRIAN TROPEA  
P. O. BOX 16205  
IRVINE, CA 92623-6205

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FCC MAIL ROOM

November 13, 1997

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary, Room 222  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

96-128

RE: FCC 97-371

Dear FCC,

I would like to heavily complain about your decision FCC 97-371, allowing Pay Phone Service Providers to charge fees for all non-coin calls completed from their payphones. At the very least, to go from zero cents to twenty-nine cents (and some companies are taking thirty-five cents in an attempt to make a small profit) is just too much.

This new charge will mostly affect the poor... those people who cannot afford their own home phone. They rely on discount calling cards (like those offered by Atcall and Worldcom and Roadtel, etc.). These discount calling cards offer consumers a wonderful sixteen-cents-per-minute rate, with absolutely no surcharges. They even bill in six-second increments, which means one can call anywhere in the U.S. at any time of the day for 30 seconds and only be charged a nickel. Each minute is only sixteen seconds. That is better than AT&T and MCI, etc. As you probably know, to access these phone company systems, one has to dial an 800 number. Now with your new FCC 97-371 rule, a surcharge of twenty-nine to thirty-five cents will be added to each call placed from a payphone. Toll-free calls are supposed to be toll-free calls! And you know that the majority of calling card calls are placed from payphones.

As a voting United States citizen, I respectfully demand that you reverse FCC 97-371, or at the very least, greatly lower the fee. I use payphones repeatedly throughout the day, each day, and I use a discount calling card. These new fees will add up fast, and I cannot afford them. I feel that they are unfair. Thank you for your attention regarding this matter and thank you for letting me vent my frustration and anger.

Sincerely,

*Brian Tropea*  
Brian Tropea

0  
FCC MAIL ROOM  
NOV 18 1997

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

NOV 18 1997

FCC MAIL ROOM

95 Lakeshore Dr  
Piscataway NJ 07866

FCC

Office of the Secretary, Rm 222  
1919 M Street NW  
Washington DC 20554

96-128

Re: FCC 97-371

Dear Sir / Madam:

I am calling to ask you to please reverse your decision. We have our daughter phone us from a pay phone in school, from the mall etc. Adding a 29¢ fee really adds her costs up - our ours too. It's such a high charge. I don't know how to tell her that this affects the 'little guy'. Our daughter has her AT&T number memorized and it certainly wakes for us!

Please change the ruling!

Jeff Dahl

0

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FCC MAIL ROOM

Todd L. Rich  
1360 N. Sandburg Terrace  
Apt. 2205C  
Chicago, IL 60610

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

November 13, 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary, Room 222  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Sir or Madam:

**Compensation to Payphone Service Providers**

I am writing this letter to voice my opposition to your new regulation mandating a 29¢ fee for using a calling card or 800/888 number at a payphone. I believe this new charge puts an unfair burden on consumers, and ultimately will hurt the very entities it is designed to compensate, the Payphone Service Providers. Why? Because by putting this fee into the consumer's phone bill, you have just made the cellular telephone even more attractive than it already is. Cellular service providers continue to become more competitive, offering lower rates (roaming and per minute charges) and affordable phones. Cellular phones are also getting smaller and more reliable. The bottom line here is that we live in a free market economy. When you raise the consumer's cost of using a payphone past the point of being cost effective, the consumer finds another vehicle with which to place phone calls. Short term, I believe your fee will generate revenues. Long term, you will just have a proportionately greater number of people carrying a cellular phone with them.

Respectfully,

*T.L. Rich*

Todd L. Rich

96-128

11/13/97  
11/13/97